UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

| APPLICATION NO. | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| 09/683,100 | 11/19/2001 | Jun Haneda | VN-0158US | 8071 |

28017 7590 07/20/2004

RYUKA
1-24-12 SHINJUKU, SIXTH FLOOR
TOSHIN BUILDING, SHINJUKU-KU
TOKYO, 160-0022
JAPAN

| EXAMINER | |
|---|---|
| OSMAN, RAMY M | |
| **ART UNIT** | **PAPER NUMBER** |
| 2157 | |

DATE MAILED: 07/20/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

| Office Action Summary | Application No. | Applicant(s) | |
|---|---|---|---|
| | 09/683,100 | HANEDA, JUN | |
| | Examiner | Art Unit | |
| | Ramy M Osman | 2157 | |

*-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --*

**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *22 April 2004*.

2a)☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☐ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-26* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-26* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119**

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

**Attachment(s)**

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
6) ☐ Other: _____.

## DETAILED ACTION

### *Status of Claims*

1. This communication is responsive to the amendment filed on April 22, 2004 where applicant amended claims 1-10 and 12-18, and added new claims 19-26. Claims 1-26 are pending.

### *Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112*

2. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

> The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

3. Claims 1,15,16,19,22,25 and 26 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

The preamble which states an "address conversion apparatus" is not achieved in the claims because the converter has been said to perform "including an identifier" or "including an alternate address" into the SNMP trap. There is inherent contradiction in the claims because the purpose of a converter is to change an item from one form to another. Whereas applicant states the converter includes an item to the trap. This is merely attaching an additional item to the original item, which does not suit the definition of a converter.

Claims 2-14,17,18,20,21,23 and 24 are also rejected because they are minor variations based upon the independent claims.

4. Claims 2-7 recite the limitation "said predetermined part" in lines 2. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in these claims.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

5. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

6. Claims 1,2,5,8, 16,19,22,25 and 26 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Peters et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,104,868) in view of Gbadegesin (US Patent No. 6,754,709).

7. In reference to claims 1,16,19,22,25 and 26, Peters teaches an address conversion apparatus for connecting a first network to a second network, comprising:

A receiving unit that receives a first SNMP trap from a communication apparatus in said first network (column 2 lines 29-67, column 6 lines 10-67, column 7 lines 1-41 & figure 6c); A converter that converts the trap indication to another format thus generating a second trap (column 2 lines 29-67, column 6 lines 10-67, column 7 lines 1-41 & figure 6c); A transmitting unit that transmits said second trap generated by said converter to a monitoring apparatus of said communication apparatus in said second network (column 2 lines 29-67, column 6 lines 10-67, column 7 lines 1-41 & figure 6c).

Peters fails to explicitly teach generating a second SNMP trap upon including an identifier in said first SNMP trap for identifying a terminal located in the first network. However, Gbadegesin teaches modifying a source address from a first network in a

packet for transmission to a second network (Abstract, column 6 lines 30-67 and column 7 lines 15-35).

It would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art to modify Peters by formatting the first SNMP trap by modifying the packet for identifying a source in a first network as per the teachings of Gbadegesin so that the trap can be transmitted to a second network.

8. In reference to claims 2 and 5, Peters teaches an address conversion apparatus as claimed in claim 1. Peters fails to teach wherein said converter changes said predetermined part of an agent address part in said first SNMP trap to a value corresponding to an address in said second network to generate said second SNMP trap. However, Gbadegesin teaches modifying an address to allow transmission to a second network (abstract, column 3 lines 39-67 and column 4 lines 29-67).

It would have been obvious for one having ordinary skill in the art to modify Peters by as per the teachings of Gbadegesin so as to allow transmission from a first network to a second network.

9. In reference to claims 8, Peters teaches the apparatus of claim 1, comprising:

Holding unit that holds said first SNMP trap (column 6 lines 37-55, column 7 lines 20-40, Peters discloses an instrumentation abstraction component where the traps are sent to be held for further processing); and

A reading unit that reads said first SNMP trap from said holding unit in response to a read request of said first trap, corresponding to said second SNMP trap, from said monitoring apparatus, and transmits said first trap to said monitoring apparatus (column 6 lines 37-55, column 7 lines 20-40, Peters discloses an instrumentation abstraction

component where the traps are sent to be held for further processing, and transmits trap to SNMP monitoring agent).

---

10. Claims 4,7,14,18,21 and 24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Peters et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,104,868) in view of Gbadegesin (US Patent No. 6,754,709) in further view of Veerina et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,243,379).

11. In reference to claims 4 and 7, Peters teaches an address conversion apparatus as claimed in claim 2. Peters fails to teach wherein said converter changes said predetermined part of a port number in said first SNMP trap to information for identifying said communication apparatus in said first network to generate said second SNMP trap. However, Veerina teaches translating a port number to an external port number to allow transmission to an external network (abstract, column 3 lines 36-67, column 4 lines 29-67 and column 6 lines 30-67).

It would have been obvious for one having ordinary skill in the art to modify Peters by as per the teachings of Veerina so as to perform multiplexing over different network links.

12. In reference to claims 14,18,21 and 24, Peters in view of Veerina teach an address conversion apparatus as claimed in claim 1 above, including a monitoring apparatus receiving an SNMP trap transmitted by a communication apparatus via an address conversion apparatus, wherein said monitoring apparatus includes a specifying unit that specifies said communication apparatus based on an agent address part in said trap. Peters fails to teach wherein the communication apparatus is specified based

on port number part of trap. However, Veerina teaches translating a port number to an external port number to allow transmission to an external network (abstract, column 3 lines 36-67, column 4 lines 29-67 and column 6 lines 30-67).

It would have been obvious for one having ordinary skill in the art to modify Peters by as per the teachings of Veerina so as to perform multiplexing over different network links.

---

13. Claims 3,6,13,17,20 and 23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Peters et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,345,279) in view of Gbadegesin (US Patent No. 6,754,709) in view of Veerina et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,243,379) in further view of Spencer (U.S. Patent No. 6,253,243).

14. In reference to claims 3 and 6, Peters in view of Veerina teaches an address conversion apparatus as claimed in claim 2 above, and using information for identifying said communication apparatus in said first network to generate said second trap. They fail to teach wherein said converter changes said predetermined part of a time stamp part in said first trap. However, Spencer teaches an SNMP trap with a timestamp field indicating when the trap was generated (column 5 lines 50-67 and column 7 lines 1-55).

It would have been obvious for one having ordinary skill in the art to modify Peters by making the converter change time stamp part in said first trap as per the teachings of Spencer so as to specify a communication apparatus for the second trap.

15. In reference to claims 13,17,20 and 23, Peters in view of Veerina teach an address conversion apparatus as claimed in claims 1 and 2 above, including a

monitoring apparatus receiving an SNMP trap transmitted by a communication apparatus via an address conversion apparatus, wherein said monitoring apparatus includes a specifying unit that specifies said communication apparatus based on an agent address part in said trap. They fail to teach wherein the communication apparatus is specified based on time stamp part of trap. However, Spencer teaches Spencer teaches an SNMP trap with a timestamp field indicating when the trap was generated (column 5 lines 50-67 and column 7 lines 1-55).

It would have been obvious for one having ordinary skill in the art to modify Peters by making the converter change time stamp part in said first trap as per the teachings of Spencer so as to specify a communication apparatus for the second trap.

***Response to Amendment***

16. The examiner acknowledges the amended claims 1-10 and 12-18 filed on 4/22/2004.

17. Applicant amended the specification to overcome the minor informality and thus the examiner withdraws the objection to the specification.

***Response to Arguments***

18. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-26 have been considered. A response to the remarks will not be given because they are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

***Conclusion***

Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Ramy M Osman whose telephone number is (703) 305-8050. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 9-5.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Ario Etienne can be reached on (703) 308-7562. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

RMO
July 9, 2004

SALEH NAJJAR
PRIMARY EXAMINER